

Source Selection Statement
Variable Frequency Drives
Solicitation Number: NNS09ZDA005R
April 19, 2010

A. Procurement History

The NASA John C. Stennis Space Center (SSC) located in Hancock County, MS, has a need for Variable Frequency Drives (VFD) Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity IDIQ contract with a minimum quantity of 3 VFDs and a maximum quantity of 20 VFDs. Contract value is a NTE of \$332,685.00. Contract length is expected to be 2 years. Specific projects will be defined in each of the subsequently issued delivery orders. The work to be performed under this contract consists of delivering VFDs to NASA Stennis Space Center. The purchase of the VFDs is in accordance with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The VFD's are crucial to the liquid oxygen centrifugal pumps. Significant delays could incur very high delay cost and put the overall testing schedule in jeopardy.

A presolicitation informational synopsis/sources sought was posted on March 03, 2010 on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) Business Opportunities and Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOps) websites. The Final Request for Proposal was released March 16, 2010. Proposals were due no later than March 26, 2010. Due to the availability of the VFDs it was determined that industry would be able to provide a responsive bid expeditiously.

This procurement is being conducted utilizing Best Value Selection (BVS), which seeks to select an offer based on the best combination of price and qualitative merit (including Technical Compliance, Schedule, and Past Performance) of the offers submitted. BVS predefines the value characteristics that will serve as the discriminators among offers and is based on the premise that, if all offers are of approximately equal qualitative merit, award will be made to the offeror with the lowest evaluated price (fixed-price contracts). However, the Government will consider awarding to an offeror with higher qualitative merit if the difference in price is commensurate with added value. Conversely, the Government will consider making award to an offeror whose offer has lower qualitative merit if the price differential between it and other offers warrant doing so.

Award will be made to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is responsive, and offers the best value to the government. The following non-priced evaluation criteria will be used: Technical Compliance, Schedule, and Past Performance. Technical Compliance, Schedule, and Past Performance are approximately equal. **When combined, these characteristics (Technical Compliance, Schedule, and Past Performance) are approximately equal to Price.** Award will be based on the best overall value to the Government. The Government reserves the right to award to other than the lowest Offeror. This process will result in the best value by allowing the Government to attain the higher quality of services if it is determined to be the best value.

The rating method that will be utilized will consist of the following:

I. Technical Compliance will receive one of the following efficiency ratings:

Each offerors technical compliance information will be evaluated to determine the effectiveness of the proposed solution. The evaluation team will assign a rating between 0 and 80.

II. Schedule will receive one of the following risk ratings:

Each offerors proposed schedule will be evaluated to determine if the schedule meets the delivery requirements. The evaluation team will assign a rating between 0 and 20.

III. Past Performance will receive one of the following adjectival ratings:

RATING	DEFINITION	STANDARD
Outstanding	Substantially exceeds requirements. Entirely favorable past performance. No Major Breach of Safety within the past three years	A significant majority of sources of information are consistently firm in stating that the offeror's performance was superior and that they would unhesitatingly do business with the offeror again. Complaints are negligible, or unfounded. The offeror has no record of criminal conduct, civil fraud, or negligence, or the record is old and the offeror has demonstrated by more than recent performance that corrective action has made the likelihood of such conduct in the future highly improbable. A major breach of safety is an act or omission of the contractor that consists of an accident, incident or exposure resulting in a fatality or mission failure; or in damage to equipment or property equal to or greater than \$1 million dollars or any "willful" or "repeat" violation cited by OSHA or a state agency operating under an OSHA approved plan within the past three years.
Above Average	Somewhat exceeds requirements. More favorable than unfavorable past performance	Most sources of information state that the offeror's performance was good, better than average and that they would willingly do business with the offeror again. Complaints, though perhaps well founded, are few and relatively minor. The offeror has no record of criminal conduct, civil fraud, or negligence, or the record is old and the offeror has demonstrated by more recent performance that corrective action has made the likelihood of such conduct in the future highly improbable.
Neutral	No record exists or the contractor has no past performance to report.	
Satisfactory	Meets requirements. Inconclusive past performance record.	Sources of information are roughly divided over the quality of the offeror's performance. While some state that they would do business with the offeror again, others are doubtful or would not. Complaints are balanced by reports of good work. The offeror has no record of criminal conduct, civil fraud, or negligence, or the record is old.
Marginal	Barely meets requirements. More unfavorable than favorable past performance	Many sources of information make unfavorable reports about the offeror's performance and either express serious doubts about doing business with the offeror again or states that they would refuse to do so. However, there are some favorable reports, and some sources of information indicate that they would do business with the offeror again. There are many significant, serious, and well-founded complaints, but there are some reports of good performance. The offeror may have been indicted, pled guilty, or may have been found guilty on matters of criminal conduct, but issues are unresolved, relatively minor, or do not reflect a company wide or managerial pattern of wrongdoing. The offeror may have lost civil suits for fraud or negligence, but there is no company wide or managerial pattern of fraudulent, negligent, or criminal conduct.
Unsatisfactory	Does not meet requirements. Entirely unfavorable past performance	A significant majority of sources of information are consistently firm in stating that the offeror's performance was entirely unsatisfactory and that they would not do business with the offeror again under any circumstances. Customer complaints are substantial or numerous and are well founded, or, although not debarred or suspended, the offeror is under indictment or has been convicted of criminal conduct, or has been found liable for fraud or negligence. The offeror either has presented no persuasive evidence of having taken appropriate corrective action that will guard against such conduct in the foreseeable future, or it appears unlikely that the corrective action will be effective.

The solicitation closed on March 26, 2010, and the initial review was conducted on the proposals received.

B. Findings

A total of three (3) proposals were received, in response to this Request for Proposal (RFP), from the following offerors: Stuart C. Irby, R.P. Gatta, Inc, and Outbound Technologies. In accordance with the evaluation process outlined in the RFP, all offerors were evaluated in accordance with step one. All offerors provided a responsive proposal.

The initial evaluation of the value characteristics consisted of: Technical Compliance, Schedule, Past Performance and Price. Consistent with step two of the evaluation process identified in the solicitation the Government determined to make selection and award without discussions.

The evaluation team reviewed the proposal from each offeror the results are noted below as follows:

EVALUATION OF PROPOSAL REVISIONS

TECHNICAL COMPLIANCE:

Offerors were required to provide an Allen-Bradley PowerFlex, 755 drive, Part No: 20G1AND302AN0NNNNN, configured with RSLogix5000® software, DeviceLogix embedded control technology, and standard embedded Ethernet communication or an equal item that represent the same salient physical, functional, or performance characteristics.

STUART C. IRBY

Irby proposed the Allen-Bradley PowerFlex drive as identified in the Statement of Work. Based on the proposed item, Irby's technical compliance rating was 80.

R.P. GATTA, INC

R.P. Gatta proposed the Allen-Bradley PowerFlex drive as identified in the Statement of Work. Based on the proposed item, R.P. Gatta's technical compliance rating was 80.

OUTBOUND TECHNOLOGIES

Outbound proposed the Allen-Bradley PowerFlex drive as identified in the Statement of Work. Based on the proposed item, Outbound's technical compliance rating was 80.

PAST PERFORMANCE:

Offeror's past performance on similar projects was evaluated to determine the quality of work previously provided and to assess the relative capability of the offeror to effectively accomplish the requirements of this contract. Past performance information was utilized to assess the extent to which contract objectives (including management, technical management, quality control, and other areas as addressed in attachment 4 of solicitation) have been achieved on comparable or related type work.

STUART C. IRBY

Past performance for Irby includes relevant contracts performed within the last three years as required in the solicitation with values up to \$500,000. One of the references stated that Stuart Irby's dedication and performance is to be commended. Based on the information reviewed and gathered during the evaluation process, Irby was determined to have an overall **Outstanding** past performance rating.

Dupont: Stuart Irby has worked with Dupont for numerous years and performed multiple contracts which entailed the delivery of VFDs and other supply items. Dupont rated Stuart Irby outstanding. Final contract prices exceed \$500,000. Stuart Irby received 117 points out of a possible 126. Based on the information received the contractor was rated overall **Outstanding**.

R.P. GATTA, INC

Past performance for R.P. Gatta includes relevant contracts performed within the last three years as required in the solicitation with values up to \$350,000. One of the references stated that R.P. Gatta has provided quality products and have been able to adapt to changes. Based on the information reviewed and gathered during the evaluation process, R.P. Gatta was determined to have an overall **Outstanding** past performance rating.

Honda of America Mfg., Inc: R.P Gatta designed and built 3-D Vision Guided Robotics Systems. This projected past performance was not utilized because it could not be determined how the scope was relevant to the supply of VFDs.

Caterpillar, Lafayette Large Engine Facility: R.P Gatta provided a spindle tool for a rocker arm which entailed five VFDs. Final contract value was \$350,367. Caterpillar rated R.P Gatta outstanding. Caterpillar stated that he has worked with R.P Gatta on 9 different projects from a few thousand dollars to over a million dollars and R.P Gatta has provided quality products and have been able to adapt to changes. R.P Gatta received 108 points out of a possible 126. Based on the information received the contractor was rated overall **Outstanding**.

US Navy: R.P Gatta built dollies for the F-18 outer wing tips. This projected past performance was not utilized because it could not be determined how the scope was relevant to the supply of VFDs.

OUTBOUND TECHNOLOGIES

Past performance for Outbound includes relevant contracts performed within the last three years, as required in the solicitation, with values up to \$2,359,404. One of the references stated the project went well and was completed on time. Based on the information reviewed and gathered during the evaluation process, Outbound was determined to have an overall **Outstanding** past performance rating.

Gallagher – Kaiser: Outbound provided Allen Bradley VFDs and engineering support. Final contract value identified was \$2,359,404. Gallagher rated the contractor Above Average. Outbound received 98 points out of a possible 126. Based on the information received Outbound's overall rating for this project was above average. After a further review of the above project, it was noted that the majority of the cost was associated with engineering support. Based on the response from Gallagher, Outbound's performance regarding just the VFD portion was **Outstanding**.

Jacobs Technologies: Outbound provided Allen Bradey VFDs and engineering support. Final contract value was \$159,191. Jacobs stated that Outbound was a subcontractor to Gallagher-Kaiser and Jacobs did not feel it was the best point of contact for a past performance questionnaire. Jacobs provided the contact information for the Gallagher-Kaiser contract.

Gallagher – Kaiser: Jacobs provided the contract information for the prime contractor as discussed above. Gallagher rated Outbound Outstanding. Final contract value identified was \$159,191. Outbound received 117 points out of a possible 126. Based on the information received the contractor was rated overall **Outstanding**.

United Water: Outbound provided VFDs and engineering labor. Final contract price was \$54,944. United Water rated Outbound Outstanding. Outbound received 125 points out of a possible 126. Based on the information received the contractor was rated overall **Outstanding**.

SCHEDULE:

Each offerors proposed schedule will be evaluated to determine if the schedule meets the delivery requirements as outlined in Performance Work Statement (attachment 5, Delivery Order #1). The required delivery schedule is three VFDs are to be delivered within six weeks after award and eleven VFDs are to be delivered within eight weeks after award.

STUART C. IRBY

Irby proposed a delivery schedule of 6 weeks after award for the PowerFlex drives. Irby also proposed a delivery schedule of 1 week after award for the LCD displays and Module 2AIs. Irby's schedule rating was 20.

R.P. GATTA, INC

R.P. Gatta proposed a delivery schedule of 6 weeks after award for the complete PowerFlex drives. R.P. Gatta's schedule rating was 20.

OUTBOUND TECHNOLOGIES

Outbound proposed a delivery schedule of 42 calendar days (6 weeks) after award for the complete PowerFlex drives. Outbound's schedule rating was 20.

PRICE:

All offerors were required to provide price information for all CLIN's including options identified on the Standard form 1449. The Government evaluated each offeror's proposed price including all options for reasonableness to determine the best value to the Government. In accordance with the solicitation and FAR 15.404-1 (a)(1) the contracting officer is responsible for evaluating the reasonableness of the offered prices. The analytical techniques and procedures described in subject reference were utilized during the price analysis evaluation. Specifically FAR 15.404-1 (b)(2)(i) and FAR 15.404-1 (b)(2)(v) were used to determine price reasonableness of the proposed prices. During this review a comparison of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation was made.

STUART C. IRBY

Irby's proposal was reviewed and evaluated as stated in the solicitation. Irby's price was considered reasonable. Irby submitted the low price proposal for delivery order 1. Irby also submitted the low price per VFD.

R.P. GATTA, INC

R.P. Gatta proposal was reviewed and evaluated as stated in the solicitation. R.P. Gatta's price was considered reasonable. R.P. Gatta submitted the 2nd lowest price proposal for delivery order 1. R.P. Gatta submitted the 3rd lowest price per VFD.

OUTBOUND TECHNOLOGIES

Outbound proposal was reviewed and evaluated as stated in the solicitation. Outbound's price was considered reasonable. Outbound submitted the 3rd lowest price proposal for delivery order 1. Outbound submitted the 2nd lowest price per VFD. Outbound did not provide a price for shipping for delivery order 1, even if Outbound delivers free of charge its proposal is the 3rd lowest price.

C. Source Selection Decision

With respect to the process and findings, the evaluation plan was followed and the evaluation of the proposals was fair, comprehensive, thorough and well-documented. I made my selection decision based on a comparative assessment of all proposals against all source selection criteria in the RFP.

Offerors	Technical Compliance Rating (Max 80)	Schedule Rating (Max 20)	Past Performance	Task Order 1 Price
Stuart C. Irby	80	20	Outstanding	\$195,959.50
R.P Gatta	80	20	Outstanding	\$200,777.00
Outbound Technologies	80	20	Outstanding	\$214,200.00

Before making my selection, I looked at the selection criteria to determine the importance of the price and non-priced factors. The solicitation prescribes that all three non-priced evaluation factors (Technical Compliance, Schedule, and Past Performance) are approximately equal.

When combined, these three value characteristics (Technical Compliance, Schedule, and Past Performance) are approximately equal to Price. Because the non-priced factors were approximately equal to price, I first looked at all offerors ratings and compared the ratings to see who the highest rated offeror was. I noticed that based on the evaluation of the non-priced factors Irby, R.P Gatta, and Outbound received the highest ratings in all areas. Not only did Irby receive the highest ratings in all areas, its proposal was also the low price offer received. Irby's price for delivery order 1 was \$4,817.50 lower than the 2nd lowest offer price submitted by R.P Gatta and \$18,240.50 lower than Outbound Technologies. In accordance with the RFP, I then looked further to see if a tradeoff would be in the best interest of the Government.

I further reviewed the ratings for each Offeror for any benefits or risk associated with each proposal. In the past performance criteria, I noted that Irby, R.P Gatta, and Outbound was rated "outstanding." As such, there were no discriminators in this value characteristic.

A comparison of the three offerors under technical compliance revealed that Irby, R.P Gatta and Outbound all received the max points of 80. As such, there were no discriminators in this value characteristic.

In Schedule, Irby, R.P Gatta and Outbound all received the max points of 20. As such, there were no discriminators in this value characteristic.

The solicitation stated that the three non-priced items were approximately equal. When combined these three value characteristics (Technical Compliance, Schedule, and Past Performance) are approximately equal to price. Irby, R.P Gatta, and Outbound received the highest ratings in all areas; however, Irby's proposal is the low price offer. A review and

comparison of the price proposals offered by Irby and R.P Gatta indicate a minimal price difference, \$4,817.50, between the proposals. After carefully reviewing the evaluation and findings for both proposals, I could not determine any significant benefit or advantage to the Government that would warrant a trade-off between Irby and R.P Gatta that would allow award to R.P Gatta.

I further reviewed the findings for Irby and Outbound in making the determination of whether a trade-off between the Offerors was advantageous and in the best interest of the government. Both offerors received the same ratings for Technical Compliance (80 pts), Schedule (20pts), and Past Performance (Outstanding). A review and comparison of the price proposals offered by Irby and Outbound indicate a price difference, \$18,240.50, between the proposals. After carefully reviewing the evaluation and findings for both proposals, I could not determine any significant benefit or advantage to the Government that would warrant a trade-off between Irby and Outbound that would allow award to Outbound.

Based on my deliberations outlined above, I conclude that Irby's proposal is the most advantageous to the Government. Irby's technical compliance rating of 80, Schedule rating of 20 and outstanding past performance, coupled with its lower price, amply demonstrate its ability to successfully complete the contract requirements while providing the overall best value to the Government. Accordingly, I select the offer submitted by Stuart C. Irby for award of the Variable Frequency Drives IDIQ contract for a total contract value NTE \$332,685.00 with a first delivery order for \$195,959.00 at Stennis Space Center.



Marvin L. Horne
Contracting Specialist

Approve / Disapprove



Robert Harris
Contracting Officer